

REMARKS

Claims 28-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-27 were canceled, without prejudice. Claims 28-37 were added in this amendment. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zhang et al.* (US Patent Application US 2004/0090954) in view of *Glitho et al.* (US Patent No 6,614,784). Applicant traverses these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, none of the cited art, alone or in combination, discloses “first signaling information is transmitted through the interface with the assistance of signaling packets of the packet-switched communication network, and the second signaling information is transmitted through the interface with the assistance of data packets of the packet-switched communication network” as recited in claim 28, and similarly in claim 37.

Regarding *Zhang*, the reference teaches a data processing system where a terminal provides signaling information via a DSS1 signaling protocol (i.e., circuit-switched) and H.323 signaling protocol (i.e., packet-switched) (paragraphs [0083-0085, 0079]). However, *Zhang* also teaches that first signaling information communicated via a terminal through a packet-switched network is exclusively transmitted according to a packet-switched communication standard ([0022-0026]). Likewise, the second signaling information is exclusively transmitted via terminal according to a circuit-switched communication standard ([0022-0026]). The gateway used in *Zhang* merely bridges incoming calls to convert one communication standard to another ([0026-0030]).

In other words, *Zhang* does not teach communication of a terminal device through an interface unit using both kinds of protocols, where the data packets of the packet-switched communication network are incorporated in the transmission of packet and circuit switched communications coming from the terminal. Furthermore, *Glitho* fails to teach this limitation as well. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is improper and should be withdrawn.

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicant submits that the present claims are allowable over the prior art. Applicant also requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Also, the Applicants have included a petition for a 2-month extension of time, along with a check in the amount of \$450.00. Should there be any additional

charges regarding this application, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 02-1818 for any insufficiency of payment.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY 

Peter Zura

Reg. No. 48,196

P.O. Box 1135

Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135

Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: January 6, 2005